

Search for Dark Matter in Events with One Jet and Missing Transverse Energy in $p\bar{p}$ Collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV

T. Aaltonen,²¹ B. Álvarez González,^{9,aa} S. Amerio,^{40a} D. Amidei,³² A. Anastassov,^{15,y} A. Annovi,¹⁷ J. Antos,¹² G. Apollinari,¹⁵ J. A. Appel,¹⁵ T. Arisawa,⁵⁴ A. Artikov,¹³ J. Asaadi,⁴⁹ W. Ashmanskas,¹⁵ B. Auerbach,⁵⁷ A. Aurisano,⁴⁹ F. Azfar,³⁹ W. Badgett,¹⁵ T. Bae,²⁵ Y. Bai,⁵⁸ A. Barbaro-Galtieri,²⁶ V. E. Barnes,⁴⁴ B. A. Barnett,²³ P. Barria,^{42a,42c} P. Bartos,¹² M. Baucé,^{40a,40b} F. Bedeschi,^{42a} S. Behari,²³ G. Bellettini,^{42a,42b} J. Bellinger,⁵⁶ D. Benjamin,¹⁴ A. Beretvas,¹⁵ A. Bhatti,⁴⁶ D. Bisello,^{40a,40b} I. Bizjak,²⁸ K. R. Bland,⁵ B. Blumenfeld,²³ A. Bocci,¹⁴ A. Bodek,⁴⁵ D. Bortoletto,⁴⁴ J. Boudreau,⁴³ A. Boveia,¹¹ L. Brigliadori,^{6a,6b} C. Bromberg,³³ E. Brucken,²¹ J. Budagov,¹³ H. S. Budd,⁴⁵ K. Burkett,¹⁵ G. Busetto,^{40a,40b} P. Bussey,¹⁹ A. Buzatu,³¹ A. Calamba,¹⁰ C. Calancha,²⁹ S. Camarda,⁴ M. Campanelli,²⁸ M. Campbell,³² F. Canelli,^{11,15} B. Carls,²² D. Carlsmith,⁵⁶ R. Carosi,^{42a} S. Carrillo,^{16,n} S. Carron,¹⁵ B. Casal,^{9,l} M. Casarsa,^{50a} A. Castro,^{6a,6b} P. Catastini,²⁰ D. Cauz,^{50a} V. Cavaliere,²² M. Cavalli-Sforza,⁴ A. Cerri,^{26,g} L. Cerrito,^{28,t} Y. C. Chen,¹ M. Chertok,⁷ G. Chiarelli,^{42a} G. Chlachidze,¹⁵ F. Chlebana,¹⁵ K. Cho,²⁵ D. Chokheli,¹³ W. H. Chung,⁵⁶ Y. S. Chung,⁴⁵ M. A. Ciocci,^{42a,42c} A. Clark,¹⁸ C. Clarke,⁵⁵ G. Compostella,^{40a,40b} M. E. Convery,¹⁵ J. Conway,⁷ M. Corbo,¹⁵ M. Cordelli,¹⁷ C. A. Cox,⁷ D. J. Cox,⁷ F. Crescioli,^{42a,42b} J. Cuevas,^{9,aa} R. Culbertson,¹⁵ D. Dagenhart,¹⁵ N. d'Ascenzo,^{15,x} M. Datta,¹⁵ P. de Barbaro,⁴⁵ M. Dell'Orso,^{42a,42b} L. Demortier,⁴⁶ M. Deninno,^{6a} F. Devoto,²¹ M. d'Errico,^{40a,40b} A. Di Canto,^{42a,42b} B. Di Ruzza,¹⁵ J. R. Dittmann,⁵ M. D'Onofrio,²⁷ S. Donati,^{42a,42b} P. Dong,¹⁵ M. Dorigo,^{50a} T. Dorigo,^{40a} K. Ebina,⁵⁴ A. Elagin,⁴⁹ A. Eppig,³² R. Erbacher,⁷ S. Errede,²² N. Ershaidat,^{15,ee} R. Eusebi,⁴⁹ S. Farrington,³⁹ M. Feindt,²⁴ J. P. Fernandez,²⁹ R. Field,¹⁶ G. Flanagan,^{15,v} R. Forrest,⁷ P. J. Fox,¹⁵ M. J. Frank,⁵ M. Franklin,²⁰ J. C. Freeman,¹⁵ Y. Funakoshi,⁵⁴ I. Furic,¹⁶ M. Gallinaro,⁴⁶ J. E. Garcia,¹⁸ A. F. Garfinkel,⁴⁴ P. Garosi,^{42a,42c} H. Gerberich,²² E. Gerchtein,¹⁵ S. Giagu,^{47a} V. Giakoumopoulou,³ P. Giannetti,^{42a} K. Gibson,⁴³ C. M. Ginsburg,¹⁵ N. Giokaris,³ P. Giromini,¹⁷ G. Giurgiu,²³ V. Glagolev,¹³ D. Glenzinski,¹⁵ M. Gold,³⁵ D. Goldin,⁴⁹ N. Goldschmidt,¹⁶ A. Golossanov,¹⁵ G. Gomez,⁹ G. Gomez-Ceballos,³⁰ M. Goncharov,³⁰ O. González,²⁹ I. Gorelov,³⁵ A. T. Goshaw,¹⁴ K. Goulianos,⁴⁶ S. Grinstein,⁴ C. Grosso-Pilcher,¹¹ R. C. Group,^{53,15} J. Guimaraes da Costa,²⁰ S. R. Hahn,¹⁵ E. Halkiadakis,⁴⁸ A. Hamaguchi,³⁸ J. Y. Han,⁴⁵ F. Happacher,¹⁷ K. Hara,⁵¹ D. Hare,⁴⁸ M. Hare,⁵² R. Harnik,¹⁵ R. F. Harr,⁵⁵ K. Hatakeyama,⁵ C. Hays,³⁹ M. Heck,²⁴ J. Heinrich,⁴¹ M. Herndon,⁵⁶ S. Hewamanage,⁵ A. Hocker,¹⁵ W. Hopkins,^{15,h} D. Horn,²⁴ S. Hou,¹ R. E. Hughes,³⁶ M. Hurwitz,¹¹ U. Husemann,⁵⁷ N. Hussain,³¹ M. Hussein,³³ J. Huston,³³ G. Introzzi,^{42a} M. Iori,^{47a,47b} A. Ivanov,^{7,q} E. James,¹⁵ D. Jang,¹⁰ B. Jayatilaka,¹⁴ E. J. Jeon,²⁵ S. Jindariani,¹⁵ M. Jones,⁴⁴ K. K. Joo,²⁵ S. Y. Jun,¹⁰ T. R. Junk,¹⁵ T. Kamon,^{25,49} P. E. Karchin,⁵⁵ A. Kashi,⁵ Y. Kato,^{38,p} W. Ketchum,¹¹ J. Keung,⁴¹ V. Khotilovich,⁴⁹ B. Kilminster,¹⁵ D. H. Kim,²⁵ H. S. Kim,²⁵ J. E. Kim,²⁵ M. J. Kim,¹⁷ S. B. Kim,²⁵ S. H. Kim,⁵¹ Y. K. Kim,¹¹ Y. J. Kim,²⁵ N. Kimura,⁵⁴ M. Kirby,¹⁵ S. Klimenko,¹⁶ K. Knoepfel,¹⁵ K. Kondo,^{54,a} D. J. Kong,²⁵ J. Konigsberg,¹⁶ A. V. Kotwal,¹⁴ M. Kreps,²⁴ J. Kroll,⁴¹ D. Krop,¹¹ M. Kruse,¹⁴ V. Krutelyov,^{49,d} T. Kuhr,²⁴ M. Kurata,⁵¹ S. Kwang,¹¹ A. T. Laasanen,⁴⁴ S. Lami,^{42a} S. Lammel,¹⁵ M. Lancaster,²⁸ R. L. Lander,⁷ K. Lannon,^{36,z} A. Lath,⁴⁸ G. Latino,^{42a,42c} T. LeCompte,² E. Lee,⁴⁹ H. S. Lee,^{11,r} J. S. Lee,²⁵ S. W. Lee,^{49,cc} S. Leo,^{42a,42b} S. Leone,^{42a} J. D. Lewis,¹⁵ A. Limosani,^{14,u} C.-J. Lin,²⁶ M. Lindgren,¹⁵ E. Lipeles,⁴¹ A. Lister,¹⁸ D. O. Litvintsev,¹⁵ C. Liu,⁴³ H. Liu,⁵³ Q. Liu,⁴⁴ T. Liu,¹⁵ S. Lockwitz,⁵⁷ A. Loginov,⁵⁷ D. Lucchesi,^{40a,40b} J. Lueck,²⁴ P. Lujan,²⁶ P. Lukens,¹⁵ G. Lungu,⁴⁶ J. Lys,²⁶ R. Lysak,^{12,f} R. Madrak,¹⁵ K. Maeshima,¹⁵ P. Maestro,^{42a,42c} S. Malik,⁴⁶ G. Manca,^{27,b} A. Manousakis-Katsikakis,³ F. Margaroli,^{47a} C. Marino,²⁴ M. Martínez,⁴ P. Mastrandrea,^{47a} K. Matera,²² M. E. Mattson,⁵⁵ A. Mazzacane,¹⁵ P. Mazzanti,^{6a} K. S. McFarland,⁴⁵ P. McIntyre,⁴⁹ R. McNulty,^{27,k} A. Mehta,²⁷ P. Mehtala,²¹ C. Mesropian,⁴⁶ T. Miao,¹⁵ D. Mietlicki,³² A. Mitra,¹ H. Miyake,⁵¹ S. Moed,¹⁵ N. Moggi,^{6a} M. N. Mondragon,^{15,n} C. S. Moon,²⁵ R. Moore,¹⁵ M. J. Morello,^{42a,42d} J. Morlock,²⁴ P. Movilla Fernandez,¹⁵ A. Mukherjee,¹⁵ Th. Muller,²⁴ P. Murat,¹⁵ M. Mussini,^{6a,6b} J. Nachtman,^{15,o} Y. Nagai,⁵¹ J. Naganoma,⁵⁴ I. Nakano,³⁷ A. Napier,⁵² J. Nett,⁴⁹ C. Neu,⁵³ M. S. Neubauer,²² J. Nielsen,^{26,e} L. Nodulman,² S. Y. Noh,²⁵ O. Norniella,²² L. Oakes,³⁹ S. H. Oh,¹⁴ Y. D. Oh,²⁵ I. Oksuzian,⁵³ T. Okusawa,³⁸ R. Orava,²¹ L. Ortolan,⁴ S. Pagan Griso,^{40a,40b} C. Pagliarone,^{50a} E. Palencia,^{9,g} V. Papadimitriou,¹⁵ A. A. Paramonov,² J. Patrick,¹⁵ G. Pauletta,^{50a,50b} C. Paus,³⁰ D. E. Pellett,⁷ A. Penzo,^{50a} T. J. Phillips,¹⁴ G. Piacentino,^{42a} E. Pianori,⁴¹ J. Pilot,³⁶ K. Pitts,²² C. Plager,⁸ L. Pondrom,⁵⁶ S. Poprocki,^{15,h} K. Potamianos,⁴⁴ F. Prokoshin,^{13,dd} A. Pranko,²⁶ F. Ptohos,^{17,i} G. Punzi,^{42a,42b} A. Rahaman,⁴³ V. Ramakrishnan,⁵⁶ N. Ranjan,⁴⁴ I. Redondo,²⁹ P. Renton,³⁹ M. Rescigno,^{47a} T. Riddick,²⁸ F. Rimondi,^{6a,6b} L. Ristori,^{42a,15} A. Robson,¹⁹ T. Rodrigo,⁹ T. Rodriguez,⁴¹ E. Rogers,²² S. Rolli,^{52,j} R. Roser,¹⁵ F. Ruffini,^{42a,42c} A. Ruiz,⁹ J. Russ,¹⁰ V. Rusu,¹⁵ A. Safonov,⁴⁹ W. K. Sakumoto,⁴⁵ Y. Sakurai,⁵⁴ L. Santi,^{50a,50b} K. Sato,⁵¹ V. Saveliev,^{15,x} A. Savoy-Navarro,^{15,bb} P. Schlabach,¹⁵ A. Schmidt,²⁴ E. E. Schmidt,¹⁵ T. Schwarz,¹⁵ L. Scodellaro,⁹ A. Scribano,^{42a,42c}

F. Scuri,^{42a} S. Seidel,³⁵ Y. Seiya,³⁸ A. Semenov,¹³ F. Sforza,^{42a,42c} S.Z. Shalhout,⁷ T. Shears,²⁷ P.F. Shepard,⁴³ M. Shimojima,^{51,w} M. Shochet,¹¹ I. Shreyber-Tecker,³⁴ A. Simonenko,¹³ P. Sinervo,³¹ K. Sliwa,⁵² J.R. Smith,⁷ F.D. Snider,¹⁵ A. Soha,¹⁵ V. Sorin,⁴ H. Song,⁴³ P. Squillacioti,^{42a,42c} M. Stancari,¹⁵ R. St. Denis,¹⁹ B. Stelzer,³¹ O. Stelzer-Chilton,³¹ D. Stentz,^{15,y} J. Strologas,³⁵ G.L. Strycker,³² Y. Sudo,⁵¹ A. Sukhanov,¹⁵ I. Suslov,¹³ K. Takemasa,⁵¹ Y. Takeuchi,⁵¹ J. Tang,¹¹ M. Tecchio,³² P.K. Teng,¹ J. Thom,^{15,h} J. Thome,¹⁰ G.A. Thompson,²² E. Thomson,⁴¹ D. Toback,⁴⁹ S. Tokar,¹² K. Tollefson,³³ T. Tomura,⁵¹ D. Tonelli,¹⁵ S. Torre,¹⁷ D. Torretta,¹⁵ P. Totaro,^{40a} M. Trovato,^{42a,42d} F. Ukegawa,⁵¹ S. Uozumi,²⁵ A. Varganov,³² F. Vázquez,^{16,n} G. Velev,¹⁵ C. Vellidis,¹⁵ M. Vidal,⁴⁴ I. Vila,⁹ R. Vilar,⁹ J. Vizán,⁹ M. Vogel,³⁵ G. Volpi,¹⁷ P. Wagner,⁴¹ R.L. Wagner,¹⁵ T. Wakisaka,³⁸ R. Wallny,⁸ S.M. Wang,¹ A. Warburton,³¹ D. Waters,²⁸ W.C. Wester III,¹⁵ D. Whiteson,^{41,c} A.B. Wicklund,² E. Wicklund,¹⁵ S. Wilbur,¹¹ F. Wick,²⁴ H.H. Williams,⁴¹ J.S. Wilson,³⁶ P. Wilson,¹⁵ B.L. Winer,³⁶ P. Wittich,^{15,h} S. Wolbers,¹⁵ H. Wolfe,³⁶ T. Wright,³² X. Wu,¹⁸ Z. Wu,⁵ K. Yamamoto,³⁸ D. Yamato,³⁸ T. Yang,¹⁵ U.K. Yang,^{11,s} Y.C. Yang,²⁵ W.-M. Yao,²⁶ G.P. Yeh,¹⁵ K. Yi,^{15,o} J. Yoh,¹⁵ K. Yorita,⁵⁴ T. Yoshida,^{38,m} G.B. Yu,¹⁴ I. Yu,²⁵ S.S. Yu,¹⁵ J.C. Yun,¹⁵ A. Zanetti,^{50a} Y. Zeng,¹⁴ C. Zhou,¹⁴ and S. Zucchelli^{6a,6b}

(CDF Collaboration)

¹*Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan 11529, Republic of China*²*Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439, USA*³*University of Athens, 157 71 Athens, Greece*⁴*Institut de Física d'Altes Energies, ICREA, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, E-08193, Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain*⁵*Baylor University, Waco, Texas 76798, USA*^{6a}*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare Bologna, I-40127 Bologna, Italy*^{6b}*University of Bologna, I-40127 Bologna, Italy*⁷*University of California, Davis, Davis, California 95616, USA*⁸*University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024, USA*⁹*Instituto de Física de Cantabria, CSIC-University of Cantabria, 39005 Santander, Spain*¹⁰*Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, USA*¹¹*Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637, USA*¹²*Comenius University, 842 48 Bratislava, Slovakia; Institute of Experimental Physics, 040 01 Kosice, Slovakia*¹³*Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, RU-141980 Dubna, Russia*¹⁴*Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708, USA*¹⁵*Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510, USA*¹⁶*University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, USA*¹⁷*Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, I-00044 Frascati, Italy*¹⁸*University of Geneva, CH-1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland*¹⁹*Glasgow University, Glasgow G12 8QQ, United Kingdom*²⁰*Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA*²¹*Division of High Energy Physics, Department of Physics, University of Helsinki and Helsinki Institute of Physics, FIN-00014, Helsinki, Finland*²²*University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801, USA*²³*The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218, USA*²⁴*Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, D-76131 Karlsruhe, Germany*²⁵*Center for High Energy Physics: Kyungpook National University, Daegu 702-701, Korea; Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742, Korea; Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 440-746, Korea; Korea Institute of Science and Technology Information, Daejeon 305-806, Korea; Chonnam National University, Gwangju 500-757, Korea; Chonbuk National University, Jeonju 561-756, Korea*²⁶*Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, USA*²⁷*University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom*²⁸*University College London, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom*²⁹*Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas Medioambientales y Tecnológicas, E-28040 Madrid, Spain*³⁰*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*³¹*Institute of Particle Physics: McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 2T8; Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada V5A 1S6; University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1A7;**and TRIUMF, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 2A3*³²*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA*³³*Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA*³⁴*Institution for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, ITEP, Moscow 117259, Russia*³⁵*University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131, USA*³⁶*The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA*

- ³⁷Okayama University, Okayama 700-8530, Japan
³⁸Osaka City University, Osaka 588, Japan
³⁹University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3RH, United Kingdom
^{40a}Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Padova-Trento
^{40b}University of Padova, I-35131 Padova, Italy
⁴¹University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA
^{42a}Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare Pisa
^{42b}University of Pisa
^{42c}University of Siena
^{42d}Scuola Normale Superiore, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
⁴³University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260, USA
⁴⁴Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907, USA
⁴⁵University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627, USA
⁴⁶The Rockefeller University, New York, New York 10065, USA
^{47a}Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Roma 1
^{47b}Sapienza Università di Roma, I-00185 Roma, Italy
⁴⁸Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08855, USA
⁴⁹Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, USA
^{50a}Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare Trieste/Udine, I-34100 Trieste
^{50b}University of Udine, I-33100 Udine, Italy
⁵¹University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305, Japan
⁵²Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts 02155, USA
⁵³University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22906, USA
⁵⁴Waseda University, Tokyo 169, Japan
⁵⁵Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48201, USA
⁵⁶University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA
⁵⁷Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06520, USA
⁵⁸SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Menlo Park, California 94025, USA
(Received 1 March 2012; published 23 May 2012)

We present the results of a search for dark matter production in the monojet signature. We analyze a sample of Tevatron $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 6.7 fb^{-1} recorded by the CDF II detector. In events with large missing transverse energy and one energetic jet, we find good agreement between the standard model prediction and the observed data. We set 90% confidence level upper limits on the dark matter production rate. The limits are translated into bounds on nucleon-dark matter scattering rates which are competitive with current direct detection bounds on spin-independent interaction below a dark matter candidate mass of $5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, and on spin-dependent interactions up to masses of $200 \text{ GeV}/c^2$.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.211804

PACS numbers: 13.85.Rm, 12.60.-i, 14.80.-j, 95.35.+d

The cosmological abundance of dark matter (DM) is now precisely known through the observation of its gravitational interactions [1]. Yet the nature of DM itself remains a mystery, with many models of physics beyond the standard model (SM) proposing DM candidates. Perhaps the best motivated DM candidate is a new weakly interacting massive particle (WIMP) with mass of $O(1-1000) \text{ GeV}/c^2$. This class of DM candidates appears in many models of new physics with interactions that allow for DM detection through WIMP-nucleon scattering in direct detection experiments [2].

While there is no conclusive evidence for WIMP-nucleon scattering, several recent direct detection experiments have yielded results suggestive of a low-mass ($\sim 10 \text{ GeV}/c^2$) WIMP [3–5]. In light of these results, there has been significant interest [6–9] in the potential of collider searches to either observe the production of DM

particles (χ), or to constrain the DM production rate. The collider mode of production that is expected to yield the most stringent bounds [6] on the DM production rate is the monojet ($p\bar{p} \rightarrow \chi\bar{\chi} + \text{jet}$) mode, where the jet has a transverse energy of $O(100) \text{ GeV}$ and originates in initial state radiation. Previous studies of the monojet signature have been performed [10–12] in the context of searches for large extra dimensions.

In this Letter, we present the results of the first direct search for collider production of DM in the monojet mode. We consider several models of DM production that are relevant for direct detection experiments. We assume χ is a Dirac fermion [13], and that production is mediated by a massive state which couples to DM and SM quarks. For this analysis, we consider three models of dark matter production which consist of vector (\mathcal{O}_V), axial-vector (\mathcal{O}_{AV}), and t -channel operators (\mathcal{O}_t) as defined in [6,7].

A universal sum over all quark flavors is assumed for these operators. In direct detection experiments, the vector operator leads to spin-independent DM scattering, while the axial-vector operator is spin dependent. The t -channel operator includes both spin-dependent and spin-independent terms. By considering the three types of operators, we are able to constrain both spin-independent and spin-dependent DM-nucleon scattering cross sections.

In direct detection experiments, scattering rates are described by an effective theory containing DM in addition to SM fields. As the momentum transfer in DM scattering is far lower than the mass of the particle mediating the interaction, an effective theory provides a valid description. In a collider environment, with large momentum transfers, the effective theory approach is not necessarily valid and may change the predicted cross section and kinematics of the DM model [6,7,14]. We thus consider two possibilities: (1) that these contact interactions are also a good description of collider DM production, and (2) that the production of DM at the Tevatron proceeds through the exchange of a new particle. The new mediator particles which lead to the operators \mathcal{O}_V , \mathcal{O}_{AV} , and \mathcal{O}_I , are a heavy vector, axial-vector, and a scalar “squark”, respectively. When constraining case 1 we implement models of DM production with very heavy mediators, well above the Tevatron reach (at 10 TeV), while for case 2 we consider light mediators, within the kinematic reach of the Tevatron (100 GeV/ c^2 for \mathcal{O}_V and \mathcal{O}_{AV} and 400 GeV/ c^2 for \mathcal{O}_I).

We perform the analysis utilizing 6.7 fb $^{-1}$ of Tevatron $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV recorded by the CDF II detector. The CDF II detector is described in detail elsewhere [15] and consists of tracking systems immersed in a 1.4 T magnetic field, surrounded by calorimetry that provides coverage for $|\eta| < 3.6$ [16]. A system of drift chambers external to the calorimetry provides muon detection capability for $|\eta| < 1.5$.

The DM candidate is expected to interact minimally with the CDF II detector resulting in large missing transverse energy (\cancel{E}_T) [17]. We analyze a sample of events consistent with this characteristic, as collected by a \cancel{E}_T online event-selection (trigger) algorithm which selects collision events with $\cancel{E}_T \geq 40$ GeV. We find that the trigger has a 90% selection efficiency for events with $\cancel{E}_T = 60$ GeV, rising to an efficiency of 95% for $\cancel{E}_T \geq 70$ GeV.

The selected events are required to have been recorded with fully-functioning calorimeter, muon, and tracking systems. We require events to have $\cancel{E}_T = 60$ GeV. We reconstruct jets from calorimeter energy deposits using a cone algorithm [18] with a radius in pseudorapidity-azimuth space of 0.4. We do not consider jets with $E_T < 20$ GeV. We reject events with jets reconstructed in partially instrumented regions of the calorimeter. Jet energies are corrected for variations in detector response and instrumentation, and the extra contribution from additional $p\bar{p}$ pair interactions in the same event [19]. Events are

required to have exactly one jet with $E_T \geq 60$ GeV. We require that this jet have $|\eta| < 1.1$. To reject events arising from noncollision sources, we require significant track activity within the jet’s cone. Events in which the jet does not contain a track with a transverse momentum (p_T) of at least 10 GeV/ c are rejected. To remove photons we require the electromagnetic fraction of the total energy deposited in the calorimeter systems to be below 0.85. Similarly, to remove events with muon bremsstrahlung from cosmic rays or beam-detector interactions [20] we require an electromagnetic fraction of greater than 0.35. To accommodate extra jets arising from initial state radiation, we retain events with one additional jet with an E_T of less than 30 GeV and $|\eta| < 2.4$.

The sample of events that pass the above selections is dominated by background contributions from QCD multi-jet processes in which one (or more) of the jets is misreconstructed. Improper reconstruction of a jet produces an event topology in which the $\vec{\cancel{E}}_T$ is aligned with the misreconstructed jet. To reduce this background we require a minimum separation in azimuthal angle of $\Delta\phi(\vec{\cancel{E}}_T, \text{jet}) > 0.4$ between the direction of $\vec{\cancel{E}}_T$ and that of any jet. We also require a separation of $\Delta\phi(\vec{\cancel{E}}_T, \text{jet}) > 2.5$ between the direction of $\vec{\cancel{E}}_T$ and the leading jet. We achieve further reduction of the multijet background to our search by utilizing an artificial neural network (NN) designed to separate multijet events from electroweak processes [21]. The NN combines event quantities including the separation in azimuthal angle between jets and $\vec{\cancel{E}}_T$, jet energies, \cancel{E}_T , and the number of jets, returning a single numerical value for each event. In training, the NN was optimized to isolate simulated Z and W boson events from a sample of data events in which the most energetic jet had $E_T < 60$ GeV, or in which there were more than three jets. We find that approximately 85% of multijet events produce a NN value of less than 0.3, and reject these events. In simulated DM samples, $\sim 90\%$ of events produce a NN value above 0.3.

In the remaining sample of events, we expect significant contributions from Z and W boson processes, in which the Z or W decays leptonically. We reduce the contribution from these processes by vetoing events which contain one or more tracks with $p_T \geq 10$ GeV/ c that are not embedded within a jet.

The events passing the above selections form our analysis sample, and are examined for the presence of events arising from DM production. Within this sample we expect significant contributions from Z boson processes in which the Z boson decays invisibly to neutrinos. In addition, we expect W boson processes to contribute whenever the lepton from the leptonically decaying W boson is outside of the acceptance of the CDF tracking system. We model W and Z boson contributions to our analysis sample using simulated events generated by ALPGEN [22] with PYTHIA [23] for particle showering and hadronization. The Z and




FIG. 1. Distribution of the leading jet E_T for the multijet control (a), electroweak control (b), and analysis (c) samples. The last bin contains the overflow. For the analysis sample, the jet E_T of a representative signal process ($\chi\bar{\chi} + \text{jet}$, $M_\chi = 1\text{ GeV}/c^2$) is shown normalized to the 90% confidence level upper limit production rate of 5.9 pb.

W boson background contributions are determined assuming NNLO calculations [24] of the inclusive production rates.

Minor backgrounds include $t\bar{t}$ modeled with PYTHIA, and single-top processes modeled with MADGRAPH [25] plus PYTHIA for particle showering and hadronization. A top-quark mass of $172.5\text{ GeV}/c^2$ is assumed for the $t\bar{t}$ [26,27] s -channel, and t -channel [28] processes with cross sections of cross sections of 7.04, 1.05, and 2.1 pb, respectively. We account for the expected diboson (WW, WZ, ZZ) [29] contributions to our selected sample with a PYTHIA simulation, and normalize the rates of the WW, WZ , and ZZ processes to 11.34, 3.47, and 3.62 pb. All simulated samples in this analysis include a detailed GEANT-based detector simulation [30] and assume CTEQ5L [31] parton distribution functions.

While our NN requirement rejects the main multijet contamination, we model the remaining multijet background using reweighted data events. We determine the likelihood of an event in our analysis sample to have originated from a multijet background process by utilizing a sample of events with relaxed kinematic selections such that events with any number of jets with E_T greater than 35 GeV are accepted. Events meeting this relaxed selection constitute the derivation sample. To maintain exclusivity, we remove all events entering the analysis sample from the derivation sample. In addition, we denote the probability that a given event originated in a multijet process as the multijet probability (MJP). This probability is taken as the fraction of events in the derivation sample that is unaccounted for by simulated backgrounds. The MJP is parameterized in six observables: \cancel{E}_T , the number of jets, the minimum separation in azimuthal angle between \cancel{E}_T and a jet, the ratio of the scalar sum of jet E_T to its sum with the \cancel{E}_T , the magnitude of the momentum imbalance from tracks with $p_T \geq 10\text{ GeV}/c$, and the \cancel{E}_T significance [32].

A given event in the analysis sample is assigned a weight by the MJP, as determined by its values of the six observables. The multijet background is modeled as the weighted

sum of all events contributing to the analysis sample. We find that the above method accurately determines the shape of the multijet background in all observables of interest. To obtain an appropriate normalization for the multijet contribution, we require that the sum of the number of events predicted by simulation and by the multijet prediction equal the number of data events observed in the sideband region which is defined such that the NN value is between 0.2 and 0.3.

To test the performance of our data model, we form two additional samples that are exclusive of the analysis sample. We define an electroweak sample that is composed of events that pass all analysis selection criteria but have one or more tracks with $p_T \geq 10\text{ GeV}/c$, that are not embedded within a jet. In addition, we define a multijet sample of events passing all the analysis selection requirements except that they have a NN value less than 0.3, \cancel{E}_T aligned with a jet, or have more than 2 jets. We find good agreement between the data and the SM prediction in both control samples. The E_T distribution of the leading jet is displayed in Fig. 1.

We model the potential contribution to our analysis sample from a DM signal of $p\bar{p} \rightarrow \chi\bar{\chi} + \text{jet}$ using a MADGRAPH [25] generator that is interfaced with PYTHIA for showering and hadronization. We generate variants of the signal models, discussed previously, assuming DM masses between 1 and $300\text{ GeV}/c^2$. We find an efficiency

TABLE I. Event totals in the analysis and control samples. Uncertainties are systematic only.

Source	Multijet	Electroweak	Analysis
Z	6949 ± 840	1280 ± 155	$22\,191 \pm 2681$
W	$14\,986 \pm 2007$	5582 ± 747	$27\,892 \pm 3735$
Multijet	$165\,479 \pm 82\,740$	1066 ± 533	3278 ± 1639
Other	2194 ± 233.4	149 ± 10.7	545 ± 39.3
Total model	$189\,608 \pm 82\,787$	8076 ± 1011	$53\,906 \pm 6022$
Data	188 361	7942	52 633

TABLE II. Expected (Exp.) and observed (Obs.) 90% C.L. upper limits (in pb) on the cross section of $p\bar{p} \rightarrow \chi\bar{\chi} + \text{jet}$ for the three operators (defined in text) \mathcal{O}_{AV} , \mathcal{O}_V , and \mathcal{O}_I , assuming contact interactions. The $\pm 1\sigma$ variations on the expected limits are also shown.

M_χ (GeV/ c^2)	\mathcal{O}_{AV}		\mathcal{O}_V		\mathcal{O}_I	
	Obs. (pb)	Exp. (pb)	Obs. (pb)	Exp. (pb)	Obs. (pb)	Exp. (pb)
1	5.9	$7.6^{+4.9}_{-3.6}$	9.1	$7.8^{+5}_{-3.5}$	6.5	$7.2^{+4.3}_{-3.6}$
5	6.9	$7.9^{+4.8}_{-3.6}$	5.4	$8.1^{+4.9}_{-4.1}$	7.5	$8.1^{+4.4}_{-3.6}$
10	4.5	$7.9^{+4.8}_{-3.5}$	6.4	$7.7^{+4.4}_{-3.6}$	5.0	$7.0^{+4.2}_{-3.1}$
50	3.4	$7.0^{+4.2}_{-3.4}$	6.6	$7.5^{+4.6}_{-3.4}$	5.3	$6.5^{+4.0}_{-3.1}$
100	4.5	$6.0^{+3.6}_{-2.9}$	5.7	$6.2^{+3.7}_{-2.8}$	4.6	$6.1^{+3.7}_{-2.9}$
200	4.8	$5.6^{+3.2}_{-2.7}$	3.9	$5.6^{+3.6}_{-2.7}$	4.2	$4.8^{+3.2}_{-2.2}$
300	3.1	$6.1^{+3.9}_{-2.7}$	3.5	$5.6^{+3.4}_{-2.4}$	2.7	$5.1^{+3.2}_{-2.4}$

of approximately 2% when imposing the analysis sample on simulated DM events.

Systematic uncertainties affecting the normalization of simulated background components and DM signal arise due to uncertainty in the integrated luminosity ($\sim 6\%$), measured jet energy scale ($\sim 7\%$), parton distribution function uncertainties ($\sim 2\%$), efficiency of the trigger used for data collection ($\sim 2\%$), choice of the renormalization scale ($\sim 2\%$), and the amount of initial and final state radiation ($\sim 1\%$). In addition, a 50% uncertainty is placed on the normalization of the multi-jet prediction. The normalization uncertainties for the top [26–28], Z/W [33], and diboson [29] processes are 10%, 8%, and 6%, respectively. We include the effect on the jet energy scale uncertainty on the shape of observed quantities, and find this to be the dominant uncertainty. We include an uncertainty on the shape of the multijet background, based on the observed variation in the multijet prediction between the analysis and electroweak samples.

The total numbers of observed and expected events in the control and analysis samples is listed in Table I. In the analysis sample, we observe 52 633 events which agrees well with the expectation of $53\,906 \pm 6022$. As we do not observe a significant excess over the number of events predicted by our background model, we proceed to quantify the maximum allowed DM production cross section.

We set limits on the DM production rate using a Bayesian likelihood [34] formed as a product of likelihoods over bins in the analysis region of the jet E_T distribution. We assume a flat prior on the signal rate, and a Gaussian prior for each systematic uncertainty including those affecting sample normalizations and shapes. We set Bayesian 90% confidence level upper limits on $\sigma(p\bar{p} \rightarrow \chi\bar{\chi} + \text{jet})$ for each of the models considered. The expected upper limits at each model point are derived by randomly generating a series of pseudo data sets, derived from the background prediction, and computing the median of the distribution of resulting upper limits. The upper limits are listed in Table II. We proceed to convert the limits into constraints on the DM-nucleon cross section following [6,8]. A comparison of the CDF limits to several direct detection results is shown in Fig. 2. The CDF limits assuming light mediators are also shown. The CDF bounds extend beyond the experimental reach of direct detection searches, which are insensitive to DM with a mass of approximately 1 GeV/ c^2 . For a DM mass of 5 GeV/ c^2 , CDF bounds on spin-independent interactions are $\mathcal{O}(10^{-38})$ cm 2 and are similar to the limits reported by the DAMIC [35] collaboration. In the case of spin-dependent interactions, we report stronger bounds of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-40})$ cm 2 for a DM mass of 1 GeV/ c^2 , rising to $\mathcal{O}(10^{-39})$ cm 2 for a mass of 200 GeV/ c^2 .

In conclusion, we have performed the first collider search for DM in the monojet production mode. We have set limits on the DM production rate, and have constrained the spin-independent nucleon-DM scattering rate for a DM mass of roughly 1 GeV/ c^2 , and between 1 and 200 GeV/ c^2 for spin-dependent interactions.




FIG. 2. Comparison of CDF results to recent results from DAMIC [35], CoGenT [4], XENON-100 [36], SIMPLE [37], and COUPP [38]. Spin-independent (left) and spin-dependent (right) bounds on dark matter-nucleon scattering cross sections are shown for the operators (defined in text) \mathcal{O}_{AV} , \mathcal{O}_V , and \mathcal{O}_I , assuming contact interactions. For comparison we also display CDF bounds assuming light mediators.

We thank the Fermilab staff and the technical staffs of the participating institutions for their vital contributions. This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy and National Science Foundation; the Italian Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare; the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan; the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada; the National Science Council of the Republic of China; the Swiss National Science Foundation; the A.P. Sloan Foundation; the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Germany; the Korean World Class University Program, the National Research Foundation of Korea; the Science and Technology Facilities Council and the Royal Society, UK; the Russian Foundation for Basic Research; the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, and Programa Consolider-Ingenio 2010, Spain; the Slovak R&D Agency; the Academy of Finland; and the Australian Research Council (ARC).

^aDeceased.

^bWith visitor from Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezionedi Cagliari, 09042 Monserrato (Cagliari), Italy.

^cWith visitor from University of California Irvine, Irvine, CA 92697, USA.

^dWith visitor from University of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA.

^eWith visitor from University of California Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA.

^fWith visitor from Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Czech Republic.

^gWith visitor from CERN, CH-1211 Geneva, Switzerland.

^hWith visitor from Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA.

ⁱWith visitor from University of Cyprus, Nicosia CY-1678, Cyprus.

^jWith visitor from Office of Science, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC 20585, USA.

^kWith visitor from University College Dublin, Dublin 4, Ireland.

^lWith visitor from ETH, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland.

^mWith visitor from University of Fukui, Fukui City, Fukui Prefecture, Japan 910-0017.

ⁿWith visitor from Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico D.F., Mexico.

^oWith visitor from University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, USA.

^pWith visitor from Kinki University, Higashi-Osaka City, Japan 577-8502.

^qWith visitor from Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, USA.

^rWith visitor from Ewha Womans University, Seoul, 120-750, Korea.

^sWith visitor from University of Manchester, Manchester M139PL, United Kingdom.

^tWith visitor from Queen Mary, University of London, London, E1 4NS, United Kingdom.

^uWith visitor from University of Melbourne, Victoria 3010, Australia.

^vWith visitor from Muons, Inc., Batavia, IL 60510, USA.

^wWith visitor from Nagasaki Institute of Applied Science, Nagasaki, Japan.

^xWith visitor from National Research Nuclear University, Moscow, Russia.

^yWith visitor from Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA.

^zWith visitor from University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA.

^{aa}With visitor from Universidad de Oviedo, E-33007 Oviedo, Spain.

^{bb}With visitor from CNRS-IN2P3, Paris, F-75205 France.

^{cc}With visitor from Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79609, USA.

^{dd}With visitor from Universidad Tecnica Federico SantaMaria, 110v Valparaiso, Chile.

^{ee}With visitor from Yarmouk University, Irbid 211-63, Jordan.

- [1] E. Komatsu *et al.* (WMAP Collaboration), *Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser.* **180**, 330 (2009).
- [2] R. J. Gaitskell, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **54**, 315 (2004).
- [3] R. Bernabei *et al.*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **67**, 39 (2010).
- [4] C. E. Aalseth *et al.* (CoGeNT Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 131301 (2011).
- [5] G. Angloher *et al.*, [arXiv:1109.0702](#).
- [6] Y. Bai, P. J. Fox, and R. Harnik, *J. High Energy Phys.* **12** (2010) 048.
- [7] P. J. Fox, R. Harnik, J. Kopp, and Y. Tsai, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** 056011 (2012).
- [8] J. Goodman *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **695**, 185 (2011).
- [9] J. Goodman *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 116010 (2010).
- [10] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 181602 (2008).
- [11] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), *Phys. Lett. B* **705**, 294 (2011).
- [12] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 201804 (2011).
- [13] Although not considered here we expect similar results for Majorana DM, with the exception being that there are no vector interactions for Majorana DM.
- [14] P. J. Fox, R. Harnik, J. Kopp, and Y. Tsai, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 014028 (2011).
- [15] D. Acosta *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 052003 (2005).
- [16] We use a cylindrical coordinate system with z along the proton beam direction, r the perpendicular radius from the central axis of the detector, and ϕ the azimuthal angle. For θ the polar angle from the proton beam, we define $\eta = -\text{Intan}(\theta/2)$, transverse momentum $p_T = p \sin\theta$ and transverse energy $E_T = E \sin\theta$.
- [17] The missing E_T (\cancel{E}_T) is defined by the sum over calorimeter towers: $\cancel{E}_T = -\sum_i E_T^i \hat{n}_i$, where i = calorimeter tower number with $|\eta| < 3.6$, \hat{n}_i is a unit vector perpendicular to the beam axis and pointing at the i th calorimeter tower. We also define $\cancel{E}_T = |\cancel{E}_T|$.

- [18] G. Blazey and B. Flaugher, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **49**, 633 (1999).
- [19] A. Bhatti *et al.*, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **566**, 375 (2006).
- [20] M. Karagoz and R.J. Tesarek, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. B* **506**, 7 (2003).
- [21] See Supplemental Material at <http://link.aps.org/supplemental/10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.211804> for details.
- [22] M.L. Mangano *et al.*, *J. High Energy Phys.* **07** (2003), 001.
- [23] T. Sjöstrand *et al.*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **135**, 238 (2001). We use PYTHIA TUNE A, R. Field and R. C. Group, [arXiv:0510198](http://arxiv.org/abs/0510198).
- [24] R. Hamberg, W.L. van Neerven, and T. Matsuura, *Nucl. Phys.* **B359**, 343 (1991).
- [25] F. Maltoni and T. Stelzer, *J. High Energy Phys.* **02** (2003) 027.
- [26] S. Moch and P. Uwer, *Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl.* **183**, 75 (2008).
- [27] A.D. Martin, W.J. Stirling, R.S. Thorne, and G. Watt, *Phys. Lett. B* **652**, 292 (2007).
- [28] N. Kidonakis, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 114012 (2006).
- [29] J.M. Campbell and R. K. Ellis, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 113006 (1999).
- [30] R. Brun *et al.*, *GEANT 3: User's Guide Geant 3.10, Geant 3.11; Rev. Version* (CERN, Geneva, 1987).
- [31] H.L. Lai *et al.* (CTEQ), *Eur. Phys. J. C* **12**, 375 (2000).
- [32] We define the \cancel{E}_T significance as $\frac{\cancel{E}_T}{\sum_i E_{T_i}}$ where i runs over all jets with $E_T > 20$ GeV and detector $|\eta| \leq 2.4$.
- [33] A. Abulencia *et al.* (CDF), *J. Phys. G* **34**, 2457 (2007).
- [34] K. Nakamura *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *J. Phys. G* **37**, 075021 (2010).
- [35] J. Barreto *et al.* (DAMIC Collaboration), [arXiv:1105.5191](http://arxiv.org/abs/1105.5191).
- [36] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON100 Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 131302 (2010).
- [37] M. Felizardo *et al.* (SIMPLE Collaboration), [arXiv:1106.3014](http://arxiv.org/abs/1106.3014).
- [38] E. Behnke *et al.* (COUPP Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 021303 (2011).